

Serial No. 09/579169

- 19 -

Art Unit: 2128

REMARKS

Claims 1-92 are pending in this application. All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Choudhury. None of the claims are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Choudhury fails to anticipate the present invention, and is also irrelevant as a reference. The presently claimed invention is directed to **configuring parameters of a packet drop scheme** such as Random Early Detection ("RED") for enhancing the stability of communications between two nodes. In particular, the parameters are configured in accordance with a control function having a drop probability which increases gradually in an overload condition. Choudhury is directed to a **fair queueing scheme** whereby a filling queue is permitted to utilize buffer space from other, underutilized queues. For example, at col. 4, lines 5-11 Choudhury teaches "if some of the allocated memory, e.g., queue 30c, is not fully utilized, then the fair-queueing scheme of the invention enables data packets arriving at queue 30b to utilize or borrow buffer space from the underutilized queue 30c, on an as-needed basis, and thus exceed the reserved allocation  $b_i$  of buffer queue 30a." Further, at col. 4, lines 41-47 Choudhury teaches "if it is determined at step 203 that there is not enough remaining memory space in the buffer to ensure accommodation of the newly arrived packet, e.g., queue 30j whose current occupancy  $q_j$  is less than  $b_j$ , needs a buffer, then a pushout scheme is implemented at step 225 to make room for the arriving packet(s)." With regard to configuring parameters of a packet drop scheme, Choudhury simply states at col. 5, lines 36-42 that the "selected pushout scheme will drop packets from the front of the longest queue in a manner similar to schemes implemented for

Serial No. 09/579169

- 20 -

Art Unit: 2128

open-loop traffic such as described [in an IEEE publication].” In other words, Choudhury doesn’t actually describe configuring parameters of a packet drop scheme.

The Office cites a passage of Choudhury from col. 6, line 31 to col. 7, line 26 as teaching the claimed element “wherein the control function prompts a gradual increase of drop probability in an overload condition.” Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited passage of Choudhury merely discusses simulation results with different implementations of RED. In particular, simulation results are discussed for FIFO-RED, FIFO-LQD, FQ-RED, FQ-LQD and FQ-RND. The differences between these implementations of RED are which packet is selected, e.g., first or last. None of the implementations specify that drop probability changes in proportion to queue fullness. Indeed, it should be noted that the presently claimed invention is not limited to particular RED implementations, as explicitly stated in the specification at page 13, lines 32-34.

Independent claims 1, 5, 14, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42-44, 54, 57-59, 61, 62, 74, 78, 79, 85, and 87-89 each recite a distinguishing limitation similar to “wherein the control function prompts a gradual increase of drop probability in an overload condition.” As discussed above, that limitation is not taught by Choudhury. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 5, 14, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42-44, 54, 57-59, 61, 62, 74, 78, 79, 85, and 87-89 is therefore requested. The dependent claims further distinguish the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims is also requested.

Serial No. 09/579169

- 21 -


Art Unit: 2128

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

1 February 2006  
Date

  
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-275  
Dd: 2/15/06